REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated October 6, 2003, having a shortened statutory period set to expire January 6, 2004. In the present Amendment, Claims 1-12 are cancelled, and Claims 13-21 are added. Claims 13-21 are now pending.

Applicants note with appreciation the telephone conference held with the Examiner on December 23, 2003, with regards to the proposed new claims.

OBJECTION TO THE ABSTRACT

In paragraph 1 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the Abstract for being too short. Applicants count 69 words in the filed abstract, which exceed the minimum of 50 words per MPEP § 608.01(b). If Applicants have miscounted, or are otherwise mistaken, Applicants respectfully request further clarification. Otherwise, this objection is respectfully traversed, and withdrawal of the objection is requested.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

In paragraph 2 of the present Office Action, several figures are objected to for failing to correlate with the specification. The specification has been amended to address these issues. Applicants therefore request that these objections be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

In paragraph 3.1 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kim* (U.S. Patent No. 5,836,010 – "*Kim*"). In paragraph 4.1, Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Tefft* (U.S. Patent No. 5,642,805 – "*Tefft*"). In paragraph 5.1, Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kim* in view of *Shipman et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,027 – "*Shipman*"). In paragraph 6, Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kim* in view of *Tefft*. Although Claims 1-12 are now cancelled, these cited pieces of prior art are now discussed relative to the pending new claims.

Kim teaches a chip-in card 24 that causes a host controller 28 to disable all input devices, including a keyboard 14 and a mouse 16 (*Kim*, col. 4, lines 17-29). The host controller 28 is

unable to selectively disable only the keyboard 14 or mouse 16; rather the keyboard 14 and mouse 16 are either both enabled or both disabled.

Tefft teaches a simple lock switch 20 that allows signals to travel from a keyboard 7 to a computer 8 (*Tefft* col. 8, lines 53-67).

Shipman teaches a System Management Interrupt (SMI) handler that controls the disabling or limited capability of a keyboard (*Shipman* col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 45). The SMI handler monitors both traffic from a processor 12 to a keyboard 30, as well as traffic from the keyboard 30 to the processor 12 (*Shipman* col. 7, lines 43-46). Multiple input ports are not monitored.

With reference to exemplary Claim 16, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest "disabling, via a first mechanism, a dedicated keyboard coupled to a dedicated keyboard port of a computer while a Power-On-Self-Test (POST) is executing in the computer; and in response to the dedicated keyboard being disabled, disabling, via a second mechanism, a Universal Serial Bus (USB) port on the computer." That is, the cited art, taken alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest disabling a USB keyboard in response to a dedicated keyboard being disabled during a Power-On-Self-Test (POST). Rather, the cited prior art, such as *Kim*, teaches both input devices (such as keyboard 14 and mouse 16) being disabled together, such that the disablement of the second input device (USB port) does not depend on the disablement of the dedicated keyboard.

With reference to Claim 13 (and its dependent claims), which is supported by U.S. Patent No. 6,487,465, which is incorporated by reference in the specification, the cited prior art does not include the claimed features herein. Applicants point out that U.S. Patent No. 6,487,465, which was filed on November 26, 2002, has IBM as a common assignee of the present application, which was filed on December 6, 1999. (See *MPEP § 706.02(k)*).

CONCLUSION

Having amended the now pending claims according to the recommendations of the Examiner, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Boice
Registration No. 44,545
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, LLP
P.O. Box 969
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 472-7800
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Page 10
Docket No. RP9-99-125
Amendment A